

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/101,825

Applicant(s)

Larsen et al

Examiner

Fozia Hamud

Group Art Unit

1647



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Fozia Hamud (Examiner I)(3) Iver Cooper (Attorney)(2) Gary Kunz (Examiner II)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jul 3, 2001Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 18

Identification of prior art discussed:

NoneAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The issues were the length of the claimed peptides, and non-natural amino acid or unusual amino acid substitutions. With respect to the length of the peptide, the possibility of keeping the length up to 15 amino acid residues were discussed and the attorney will discuss this with his client. With respect to the non-natural amino acids, Mr. Cooper sent three catalogs that sell non-natural amino acids, however, since these catalogs were not originally incorporated as references, they will constitute new matter. The non-natural amino acids on pages 17-18 of the specification will be considered, however, Applicant has to send evidence of analogs with said substitutions that are active. Claim 18 is unclear, Mr. Cooper offered to rewrite the claim. Mr Cooper mentioned another case which might have double-patenting issues with this case, however, he did not give the serial number of said case, we will try to do an inventor search to pickup the case, however, we may request from Mr. Cooper to provide us with the serial number of the other case. Lastly, we will consult and search peptides with the claimed subs.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Gary L. Kunz  
GARY L. KUNZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.